(2) Strict application would also apparently require the introduction of a new name for a species well-defined and well-known at present as *Belemnitella mucronata* and it is nowhere suggested that any useful result would accrue from this.

The minor doubt as to precise horizon of the proposed neotype does not appear to me to be significant. Zoologically speaking, the specimen is a good one. My interest in this matter arises from work as a University teacher, museum curator and hydrological geologist in East Anglia, a region where the fossil in question, *B. mucronata* Jeletzky, is common and of importance in several aspects of my work.

By C. W. Wright (*London*)

I strongly support J. A. Jeletzky's proposals, designed to stabilise current usage of *Belemnitella mucronata* and *Belemnella*. Any result other than that which he seeks to achieve would have most serious effects by making incomprehensible a whole mass of literature of great stratigraphical importance, which is based on the current usage of the names in question.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A NEOTYPE FOR *CANCER SETIFERUS* LINNAEUS, 1758. Z.N.(S.) 1617

(see volume 21, pages 227–234)

By Alfred R. Smalley (*Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana, U.S.A.*)

The lengthy discussion of Holthuis' proposal to validate a neotype for *Cancer setiferus* Linnaeus, 1767 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **21** (3) : 227–229, 1964; comments by Gunter, Ingle, and Holthuis, *ibid.*, 229–234; and references therein) results from the difficulty in determining a type locality for Seba's specimen. Regardless of the worth of the various points considered by Holthuis and Gunter, the question of the type locality apparently cannot be finally settled to the satisfaction of all. Gunter's most serious objections to Burkenroad's neotype designation really goes back to the provenance of the holotype.

Since the matter cannot be settled on the basis of the systematic evidence, frequency of usage becomes all the more important. Application of the name *Penaeus setiferus* to the white shrimp of the West Indies and South America would be very upsetting to fishery biologists of the Americas. Surely Mr. Ingle recognizes that he very probably represents a minority opinion among fishery biologists, who are disturbed by, if not antagonistic to, nomenclatural changes in common species, particularly for non-zoological reasons.

Therefore, the interests of stability, if not the weight of taxonomic evidence, favors the proposal of Dr. Holthuis to validate Burkenroad's neotype designation of *Cancer setiferus*.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF THE MAMMALIAN FAMILY-GROUP NAME CIMOLESTIDAE MARSH, 1889. Z.N.(S.) 1630

(see volume 21, page 363)

By Charles A. Long (*Department of Zoology, University of Illinois, Urbana*)

1. In regard to the proposal calling for suppression of the mammalian family-group name CIMOLESTIDAE Marsh, 1889, I concur that suppression best serves the aims of maintaining stability and universality of nomenclature.

2. If the rules of priority were followed in arranging *Cimolestes incisus* Marsh, 1889, in the family PALAEORYCTIDAE Winge, 1917, this family-name would be replaced by the older CIMOLESTIDAE. Clemens *et al.* (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **21** (5) : 363) properly

referred this case to the Commission (inasmuch as *C. incisus* was misidentified); their request for suppression is one of two possible actions. At first glance, usual taxonomic practice involving priority seems warranted; PALAEORYCTIDAE has been in use only 48 years and CIMOLESTIDAE has lain in disuse only 35 years. Neither is a nomen oblitum. Furthermore, not many persons have studied fossil mammals of the aforementioned taxa, and the literature is not burdened by their names.

3. If PALAEORYCTIDAE were supplanted by the older name CIMOLESTIDAE, the latter taxon no longer would include marsupials, as it did previously, but would instead include numerous insectivores formerly known as palaeoryctids. Furthermore, most palaeoryctids after 1958 are those insectivores which before that date and since 1926 comprised the DELTATHERIDIIDAE Gregory and Simpson. This confusing revolution of names resulting from usual practice alternative to suppression is complicated by consideration of animals in time as well as space. Suppression of the name CIMOLESTIDAE seems to me to best maintain stability of the names concerned, permitting more effort and print to be devoted toward study of the fossils themselves instead of toward determining and explaining names and time-ranges.

4. Including *C. incisus* with the other palaeoryctids hardly alters the concept of this family, as pointed out by the authors. One point in favor of following rules of priority, no matter what, is the preservation of the concepts of early workers as well as those of recent workers. In this case the early concept of *C. incisus* and its relationships is of little worth.

SUPPLEMENT TO THE APPLICATION CONCERNING THE VALIDATION OF *AMAUROBIUS* C. L. KOCH AND *COELOTES* BLACKWALL. Z.N.(S.) 1625

(see volume 21, pages 150–153)

By Herbert W. Levi (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*) and Otto Kraus (*Natur-Museum und Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a.M., Germany*)

(1) The main purpose of the original proposal is the stabilisation of accustomed usage of the generic names *Amaurobius* C. L. Koch, 1837, and *Coelotes* Blackwall, 1841. But we find now that the application needs to settle also the interpretation of the type-species of *Coelotes*. The problem is set out below.

(2) At the time when the generic name *Coelotes* was established by Blackwall (1841), only one included species was mentioned: *Clubiona saxatilis* Blackwall, 1833, which consequently is the type-species (by monotypy). It was generally accepted by arachnologists that *saxatilis* would be a junior subjective synonym of *Drassus atropos* Walckenaer 1830. These are the reasons why Levi and Kraus in their original application correctly cited *saxatilis* as type-species of the genus, but asked to place the " valid " name *atropos* on the Official List.

(3) P. Chrysanthus now points out[1] that in this current sense *atropos* is to be regarded a misidentified species: in contradiction to *atropos* autt., *atropos* Walckenaer 1830 with high probability seems to be a senior subjective synonym of *Aranea terrestris* Wider 1834 [= *Coelotes*], a closely related species, and thus the species currently known as *C. atropos* would loose its name, and should be called *saxatilis* Blackwall 1833. On the other hand, *atropos* would replace the well-known name *terrestris*. This is more than a case of simple name changing, for the transfer of the name *atropos* from one species to another within the same genus would lead to hopeless confusion.

Coelotes atropos and *terrestris* are very important specific names in spiders. They refer to two of the most common European species, and they are almost continuously cited now in connection not only with taxonomic but also faunistic, ecological, and

[1] We wish to express our sincere thanks to Father Chrysanthus who informed us (in litt.) of his conclusions.